

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. REAL PARTY IN INTEREST	1
II. RELATED APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES	1
III. STATUS OF CLAIMS	2
IV. STATUS OF AMENDMENTS.....	2
V. SUMMARY OF CLAIMED SUBJECT MATTER	2
VI. GROUNDS OF REJECTION TO BE REVIEWED ON APPEAL.....	5
VII. ARGUMENT.....	6
VIII. CLAIMS APPENDIX	17
IX. EVIDENCE APPENDIX	24
X. RELATED PROCEEDINGS APPENDIX	25

**IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE
BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES**

In re Application of	:	Customer Number: 46321
	:	
Joseph A. RUSSO, et al.	:	Confirmation Number: 5725
	:	
Application No.: 10/737,131	:	Group Art Unit: 2154
	:	
Filed: December 15, 2003	:	Examiner: Wen-Tai Lin
	:	
For: COMMUNITY ENROLLMENT MODELING	:	

APPEAL BRIEF

Mail Stop Appeal Brief - Patents
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

This Appeal Brief is submitted in support of the Notice of Appeal filed August 14, 2009, and in response to the Final Office Action dated May 14, 2009 (the "Fourth Office Action"), wherein Appellants appeal from the Examiner's rejection of claims 1 and 3-9.

I. REAL PARTY IN INTEREST

This application is assigned to International Business Machines Corporation by assignment recorded on December 15, 2003, at Reel 014803, Frame 0439..

II. RELATED APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES

Appellants are unaware of any related appeals and interferences.

III. STATUS OF CLAIMS

Claims 1-10 and 31-50 are pending and four-times rejected in this Application. Claims 11-30 have been cancelled. It is from the multiple rejections of claims 1-10 and 31-50 that this Appeal is taken.

IV. STATUS OF AMENDMENTS

The claims have been amended subsequent to the imposition of the Final Office Action dated May 14, 2009 (the “Fourth Office Action”). In an Amendment under 37 CFR § 1.116, the Appellants amended independent claims 1 and 31 to recited structural features to overcome the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 101. In an Advisory Action dated August 7, 2009, the Examiner acknowledged that Applicants’ Reply overcome the 35 U.S.C. § 101 rejections and entered the amendments to independent claims 1 and 31.

V. SUMMARY OF CLAIMED SUBJECT MATTER

1 Referring to Figures 1 and 3-6 and also to independent claim 1, a computer implement
2 method for managing member enrollment in a collaborative computing community is disclosed
3 (lines 1-3 of paragraph [0017]). The method for managing member enrollment in a collaborative
4 computing community can include identifying one or more end user persons for enrollment in
5 the collaborative computing community and implementing an enrollment model, which is
6 executed in memory by a processor of a collaborative computing server, to determine whether to
7 enroll the one or more identified end user persons as members in the community (lines 4-8 of
8 paragraph [0006]). The method further can include updating community membership to enroll
9 the one or more end user persons based on the implemented enrollment model (lines 8-10 of

paragraph [0006]). The implementation of enrollment models can include designating one or more community members as administrators with the authority to grant enrollment to the one or more end user persons (lines 2-5 of paragraph [0022]), identifying one or more criteria for defining a role in the collaborative computing community (lines 5-6 of paragraph [0024]), providing one or more of the end user persons with the ability to grant enrollment to themselves (lines 1-4 of paragraph [0029]), and designating one or more community members as a sponsor member having privileges, the sponsor member granted a further privilege of sponsoring one or more of the end user persons for community membership as a sponsored member, wherein the sponsored member is granted enrollment in the community with privileges equal or less than the privileges of the sponsor member (lines 1-12 of paragraph [0030]).

Referring to Figures 1 and 3-6 and also to independent claim 31, a computer program product comprising a computer readable storage medium having computer usable program code for managing member enrollment in a collaborative computing community is disclosed (lines 2-5 of paragraph [0008]). The computer program product comprising a computer readable storage medium having computer usable program code for managing member enrollment in a collaborative computing community can include identifying one or more end user persons for enrollment in the collaborative computing community and implementing an enrollment model, which is executed in memory by a processor of a collaborative computing server, to determine whether to enroll the one or more identified end user persons as members in the community (lines 5-9 of paragraph [0008]). The method further can include updating community membership to enroll the one or more end user persons based on the implemented enrollment model (lines 10-12 of paragraph [0006]). The implementation of enrollment models can include designating one or more community members as administrators with the authority to grant

enrollment to the one or more end user persons (lines 2-5 of paragraph [0022]), identifying one or more criteria for defining a role in the collaborative computing community (lines 5-6 of paragraph [0024]), providing one or more of the end user persons with the ability to grant enrollment to themselves (lines 1-4 of paragraph [0029]), and designating one or more community members as a sponsor member having privileges, the sponsor member granted a further privilege of sponsoring one or more of the end user persons for community membership as a sponsored member, wherein the sponsored member is granted enrollment in the community with privileges equal or less than the privileges of the sponsor member (lines 1-12 of paragraph [0030]).

Referring to Figures 1 and 2 and also to independent claim 41, a system for managing member enrollment in a networked collaborative computing community is disclosed. The system 18 for managing member enrollment in a networked collaborative computing community includes a workstation 22, 24, a collaborative computing server 26, a computer network 20 for providing data communication between the workstation 22, 24 and the collaborative computing server 26 (lines 1-6 of paragraph [0018]). The collaborative computing server 26 is operative to identify one or more end user persons for enrollment in the collaborative computing community and implement an enrollment model to determine whether to enroll the one or more identified end user persons as members in the community (lines 5-9 of paragraph [0008]). The system then updates community membership to enroll the one or more end user persons based on the implemented enrollment model (lines 10-12 of paragraph [0008]).

VI. GROUNDS OF REJECTION TO BE REVIEWED ON APPEAL

1. Claims 1-9, 31-39 and 41-49 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,480,885 to Olivier (hereinafter Olivier).

VII. ARGUMENT

THE REJECTION OF CLAIMS 1-9, 31-39 AND 41-49 UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102 FOR ANTICIPATION BASED UPON OLIVIER

For the convenience of the Honorable Board in addressing the rejections, claims 2, 4-7 and 8 stand or fall together with independent claim 1; claim 3 stands or falls with claim 2; claims 9-10 stand or fall together with claim 8; claims 32, 34-37 and 38 stand or fall with independent claim 31; claim 33 stands or falls with claim 32; claims 39-40 stand or fall together with claim 38; claims 22, 44-47 and 48 stand or fall with independent claim 41; claim 43 stands or falls with claim 42; claims 49-50 stand or fall together with claim 48.

As is evident from Appellant's previously-presented comments during prosecution of the present Application and from Appellant's comments below, there are questions as to how the limitations in the claims correspond to features in the applied prior art. In this regard, reference is made to M.P.E.P. § 1207.02, entitled "Contents of Examiner's Answer." Specifically, the following is stated:

(A) CONTENT REQUIREMENTS FOR EXAMINER'S ANSWER. The examiner's answer is required to include, under appropriate headings, in the order indicated, the following items:

...

(9)(e) For each rejection under 35 U.S.C. 102 or 103 where there are questions as to how limitations in the claims correspond to features in the prior art even after the examiner complies with the requirements of paragraphs (c) and (d) of this section, the examiner must compare at least one of the rejected claims feature by feature with the prior art relied on in the rejection. The comparison must align the language of the claim side-by-side with a reference to the specific page, line number, drawing reference number, and quotation from the prior art, as appropriate. (emphasis added).

Therefore, if the Examiner is to maintain the present rejections and intends to file an Examiner's Answer, the Examiner is required to include the aforementioned section in the Examiner's Answer.

The factual determination of anticipation under 35 U.S.C. § 102 requires the identical disclosure, either explicitly or inherently, of each element of a claimed invention in a single reference.¹ Moreover, the anticipating prior art reference must describe the recited invention with sufficient clarity and detail to establish that the claimed limitations existed in the prior art and that such existence would be recognized by one having ordinary skill in the art.²

“Both anticipation under § 102 and obviousness under § 103 are two-step inquiries. The first step in both analyses is a proper construction of the claims. ... The second step in the analyses requires a comparison of the properly construed claim to the prior art.”³ During patent examination, the pending claims must be “given their broadest reasonable interpretation consistent with the specification,”⁴ and the broadest reasonable interpretation of the claims must also be consistent with the interpretation that those skilled in the art would reach.⁵ Therefore, the Examiner must (i) identify the individual elements of the claims and properly construe these individual elements,⁶ , and (ii) identify corresponding elements disclosed in the allegedly anticipating reference and compare these allegedly corresponding elements to the individual

¹ *In re Rijckaert*, 9 F.3d 1531, 28 USPQ2d 1955 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.*, 868 F.2d 1226, 1236, 9 USPQ2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989); *Perkin-Elmer Corp. v. Computervision Corp.*, 732 F.2d 888, 894, 221 USPQ 669, 673 (Fed. Cir. 1984).

² See *In re Spada*, 911 F.2d 705, 708, 15 USPQ 1655, 1657 (Fed. Cir. 1990); *Diversitech Corp. v. Century Steps Inc.*, 850 F.2d 675, 678, 7 USPQ2d 1315, 1317 (Fed. Cir. 1988).

³ *Medichem S.A. v. Rolabo, S.L.*, 353 F.3d 928, 933 (Fed. Cir. 2003) (internal citations omitted).

⁴ *In re Hyatt*, 211 F.3d 1367, 1372, 54 USPQ2d 1664, 1667 (Fed. Cir. 2000).

⁵ *In re Cortright*, 165 F.3d 1353, 1359, 49 USPQ2d 1464, 1468 (Fed. Cir. 1999).

⁶ See also, *Panduit Corp. v. Dennison Mfg. Co.*, 810 F.2d 1561, 1567-68 (Fed. Cir. 1987) (In making a patentability determination, analysis must begin with the question, “what is the invention claimed?” since “[c]laim interpretation. . . will normally control the remainder of the decisional process”); see *Cechter v. Davidson*, 116 F.3d 1454, 1460 (Fed. Cir. 1997) (requiring explicit claim construction as to any terms in dispute).

elements of the claims.⁷ This burden has not been met. In this regard, the Examiner's rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102 also fails to comply with 37 C.F.R. § 1.104(c).⁸

Prior to addressing the specifics of the Examiner's rejection, Appellants wish to address certain themes that have been consistently present throughout the extensive prosecution of the present application. The Examiner's analysis appears to be conclusion-based in that the Examiner's desired conclusion (i.e., the claims are identically disclosed by the prior art) is driving the Examiner's analysis of the prior art instead of having the Examiner's analysis of the prior art driving the Examiner's conclusion.

As identified by Appellants throughout the prosecution of the present Application, the Examiner's analysis fails to specifically identify many of the claimed elements relied upon by the Examiner in rejecting the claims. Moreover, although the Examiner has consistently "interpreted broadly"⁹ the language of the claim, the Examiner fails to (i) provide explicit claim constructions for the language at issue; (ii) explain why the Examiner's claim construction is both broad and *reasonable*; (iii) explain why the Examiner's claim construction is consistent with Appellants' specification and consistent with the meaning one having ordinary skill in the art would attribute to the language; and (iv) provide factual support for any of the Examiner's analysis. Instead, the Examiner's analysis consists of conclusory statements that the applied prior art teaches the limitation of the claims without substantive explanation.

⁷ Lindermann Maschinenfabrik GMBH v. American Hoist & Derrick Co., 730 F.2d 1452, 221 USPQ 481 (Fed. Cir. 1984).

⁸ 37 C.F.R. § 1.104(c) provides:

In rejecting claims for want of novelty or for obviousness, the examiner must cite the best references at his or her command. When a reference is complex or shows or describes inventions other than that claimed by the applicant, the particular part relied on must be designated as nearly as practicable. The pertinence of each reference, if not apparent, must be clearly explained and each rejected claim specified.

⁹ See, e.g., paragraphs 9-13 of the Fourth Office Action.

Claim 1

In Applicants' response to the Third Office Action dated November 21, 2008, the Applicants stated that Applicants' claims all refer explicitly to a "collaborative computing community". **Nowhere in Olivier is a collaborative computing community disclosed.**

Exemplary claim 1 recites as follows:

1. A method for managing member enrollment in a collaborative computing community, the method comprising:
identifying one or more end user persons for enrollment in the collaborative computing community;
implementing an enrollment model to determine whether to enroll the one or more identified end user persons as members in the community; and
updating community membership to enroll the one or more end user persons based on the implemented enrollment model.

In response to the above-reproduced arguments (incorporated herein), in paragraph 9 on page 6 of the Fourth Office Action, the Examiner expressly stated that the "identifying one or more end user persons for enrollment in the collaborative computing community" is disclosed in the Abstract of Olivier. A careful examination of the Abstract of Olivier fails to find any mention of a "identifying one or more end user persons for enrollment in the collaborative computing community". Instead, the Abstract of Olivier is limited to describing a method for "enabling users to exchange group electronic mail by establishing individual profiles and criteria" (see lines 1-3 of the Abstract of Olivier).

The Abstract of Olivier is a far cry from the "collaborative computing community" of the Applicants. In particular, the Applicants have defined the "collaborative computing community" as being "defined by (1) a particular context, i.e., the objective of the environment, (2) membership, i.e., the participants in the environment, (3) a set of roles for the members, and (4)

resources and tools which can be accessed by the membership in furtherance of the objective of the environment” (See paragraph [0003] of Applicants’ specification).

In response to the above-reproduced arguments (incorporated herein), the Examiner asserted the following in the paragraph 22 on page 9 of the Fourth Office Action dated May 14, 2009:

Applicant is reminded that the definition found in paragraph [0003] is not a precise and exclusive definition for the collaborative computing community in the claims because paragraph [0003] only gives a possible definition (note the phrase “can be defined” at line 6 of paragraph [0003]). The arguments regarding the aspect of the collaborative computing community definition is moot because the definition is not found in the claim.

Appellants respectfully disagree with the Examiner’s assertion. The first step in the analysis is a proper construction of the claims that is consistent with Appellants’ specification.”¹⁰ The Examiner has committed reversible error by failing to provide a claim construction of the term “collaborative computing environment” that is consistent with Appellants’ specification.

In paragraph 18 of the Second Office Action dated April 30, 2008, the Examiner stated that:

...Olivier teaches that a member may volunteer to be a moderator functioning as a human filter for inappropriate messages, scanning for “spasm”, and other messages that shouldn’t be sent to subscribers. At col. 17 lines 7-20, a special role called “approval user” is described in forming a professional jazz team...For example, spam filtering and language translation tools are described at col. 17, lines 21-39. Servers functioning at different stages of community activities are depicted in Fig. 7 and its related passages. All of which can be accessed by the membership in furtherance of the objective of the environment.

For ease of reference, the Examiner’s cited passages are reproduced below:

An example is a professional sub-group of a jazz mailing list. Subscribers checking the “Professional” experience checkbox would need to be approved before admittance. In this case, the subscriber is told that his subscription will need to be approved, and his subscription record is

¹⁰ In re Hyatt, 211 F.3d 1367, 1372, 54 USPQ2d 1664, 1667 (Fed. Cir. 2000).

stored in a pending subscriptions table. The approval user is emailed with a request for approval. If the approval does not take place within 14 days, the subscriber is automatically rejected by the system. (emphasis added)

And;

Another additional feature is to install a process near the beginning of the email distribution process for eliminating unwanted commercial email ("spam"). Such systems are commercially available and are configured independently of this invention. The email server process would allow the service provider to configure it to incorporate a spam elimination process at the appropriate step in the process. (emphasis added)

And;

Another alternative embodiment to FIG. 5B is depicted in FIG. 7. In this embodiment, the matching is done through multiple computers operating as a distributed system. All communication between computers is through a standard means such as CORBA. A Match Dispatch Server computer distributes the matching process across a cluster of Match Servers. Each match server handles part of the total number of subscriptions in the system. Each match server keeps its own cached copy of the database data for high-speed access during the matching process. To conduct a match, a client sends a match request to the Match Dispatch Server ("dispatcher"). The dispatcher has a lookup table describing which Match Servers are needed to compute a particular match. The dispatcher returns a list of Match Servers to use in completing a dynamic match. The client then requests those match servers to perform partial matches, and the results are combined for the final answer. The lookup table is centralized on the dispatcher system. Data changes (e.g., from a user tuning his community settings on the web site) will first be stored in an SQL database, and then updates distributed to appropriate server(s). Although FIG. 7 only shows a single dispatcher, multiple redundant dispatchers may be used.

How these passages identically disclose the claimed invention is entirely unclear. For example, the cited passage of Olivier is specifically directed to a "mailing list" from which a subscriber can receive electric mail, which falls short of a "collaborative computing environment" as recited in claim 1. Moreover, the cited passage is silent as to what "enrollment model" is to be implemented. In addition, the Examiner's reliance on column 17, lines 21-29 to teach "various resources and tools" made available for use in the electronic mail system of Olivier is unsupported. In fact, Olivier teaches in the cited passage that the "email server process would allow the service provider to configure it to incorporate a spam elimination process." There is no indication that an individual user or subscriber would deploy or implement the "spam filter" selectively.

The Examiner's reliance on the "language translation tool" is also misplaced. The cited passage of Olivier is silence as to any collaborative endeavor of different users or subscribers with respect to the language translation tool. Specifically, the "user specifies the language of choice as part of the subscription process" (col. 17, lines 30-31 of Olivier). In other words, when the user initially subscribes to the Olivier email distribution process, that user selects a language that the user prefers to receive email messages. Accordingly, the cited passages by the Examiner fail to support the elements and/or limitations that the Examiner has relied on them to teach or disclose. Therefore, the Examiner has failed to establish that Olivier identically discloses the claimed invention, as recited in claim 1, within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. § 102. Appellant respectfully requests that the Honorable Board reverse this rejection.

Claim 2

At paragraph 10 of the Fourth Office Action, the Examiner erroneously asserts that Fig. 8, col.10, lines 43-59 of Olivier discloses "wherein implementing an enrollment model includes designating one or more community members as administrators with the authority to grant enrollment to the one or more end user persons," as recited in claim 2. For the convenience of the Honorable Board a verbatim reproduction of the recited portion of Olivier is provided herein:

To summarize by way of example, suppose a user decides to try out a mailing list that uses this invention. He signs up at the service provider's web site, selecting a mailing list about the topic of financial investments. He specifies (user profile acceptance criteria data) he would like to interact with other men of age 40-50 who live within three miles of him and do not have children. Using an optional feature, he selects the subtopics (message criteria) related to internet stocks, junk bonds, and international mutual funds. The system responds with a preview of 38 matching subscribers and five messages per week. He wants more people to interact with, so he increases his age criteria to include men between 35-55. He also increases his distance criteria to five miles. Now the system matches him with 68 people and 12 messages per week, and he accepts the setup. The system stores that subscription; soon he will begin interacting with his matched subscribers. 1. (emphasized added).

Notably, there is no mention of “wherein implementing an enrollment model includes designating one or more community members as administrators with the authority to grant enrollment to the one or more end user persons”. In contrast, Fig. 8; col.10, lines 43-59 of Olivier teaches a list of potential users that matched that users inquiry, but the passage is silence to the “authority to grant enrollment to the one or more end user persons”. Accordingly, the Examiner has failed to establish that the applied art teaches all of the claimed features. Specifically, the Examiner’s analysis ignores the active step of “granting enrollment to the one or more end user persons” as claimed.

In response to the above-reproduced arguments (incorporated herein), the Examiner asserted the following in paragraph 22 spanning pages 9 and 10 of the Fourth Office Action:

Applicant is reminded that a sponsor of Olivier's chorus group may use proximity distance as a criterion to rule out certain system subscribers from joining the group, for example (see e.g., Fig. 8). Since the distance metric is given by the sponsor (or administrator), it serves as an authority to granting membership to certain qualified subscribers.

It appears to the Appellants that the Examiner meant to cite to Fig. 9 instead of Fig. 8 as Fig. 8 does not reference a “chorus group”. Figure 9 is described by Olivier as illustrating an ordinary email message from an unknown user which contains the unknown user’s profile and criteria data (Block 522). The Olivier system can use the unknown user’s profile and criteria data to cross-match the unknown user with the known subscribers of the Olivier system. If a match is made then that known subscriber will receive the unknown user’s email message. Accordingly, Figure 9 and the corresponding text at column 12, lines 57-65, merely provide a list of email addresses to which the email message from the unknown message will be sent. The production of a list of email users who will receive an email message is not equivalent to 1) “designating one or more community members as administrators” and 2) providing the administrator “with the

1 authority to grant enrollment to the one or more end user persons.” Moreover, the unknown user
2 is not a “community member” and the unknown user does not “grant enrollment” but merely
3 extends an invitation

4 Accordingly, the Examiner has failed to designate the teaching in Olivier being relied
5 upon to state the rejection. In this regard, the Examiner’s rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102 fails to
6 comply with 37 C.F.R. § 1.104(C). Thus, as it will be clear to the Honorable Board, Olivier fails
7 as a reference to anticipate the claimed invention.

8
9 Claims 31, 32, 41 and 42

10 Independent claims 31 and 41 recite the “collaborative computing community” limitation
11 and Appellants incorporate herein the arguments previously advanced in traversing the imposed
12 rejection of claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 102 for anticipation based upon Olivier.

13
14 Dependent claims 32 and 42 recite the “designating one or more community members as
15 administrators with the authority to grant enrollment to the one or more end user persons” and
16 Appellants incorporate herein the arguments previously advanced in traversing the imposed
17 rejection of claim 2 under 35 U.S.C. § 102 for anticipation based upon Olivier.

18
19 Claims 3-10, 33-40 and 43-50 dependent from independent claims 1, 31 and 41, respectively
20 and Appellants incorporate herein the arguments previously advanced in traversing the imposed
21 rejection of claims 1, 31 and 41 under 35 U.S.C. § 102 for anticipation based upon Olivier.

Appellant, therefore, respectfully submits that the imposed rejection of claim 1-9, 31-39 and 41-49 under 35 U.S.C. § 102 for anticipation based upon Olivier is not viable.

Conclusion

Based upon the foregoing, Appellants respectfully submit that the Examiner's rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102 are not viable. Appellants, therefore, respectfully solicit the Honorable Board to reverse the Examiner's rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102.

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 500563, and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Date: October 14, 2009

Respectfully submitted,

/Steven M. Greenberg/

Steven M. Greenberg,
Reg. No.: 44,725
Adam C. Underwood
Reg. No. 45,169
Carey, Rodriguez, Greenberg & Paul, LLP
Tel: (561) 922-3845
Fax: (561) 244-1062
Customer Number 46321

VIII. CLAIMS APPENDIX

1. A computer implemented method for managing member enrollment in a collaborative computing community, the method comprising:

identifying one or more end user persons for enrollment in the collaborative computing community;

implementing an enrollment model, executing in memory by a processor of a collaborative computing server, to determine whether to enroll the one or more identified end user persons as members in the community; and

updating community membership in an electronic storage medium of the collaborative computing server to enroll the one or more end user persons based on the implemented enrollment model.

2. The method of claim 1, wherein the implementing an enrollment model includes designating one or more community members as administrators with the authority to grant enrollment to the one or more end user persons.

3. The method of claim 2, further including providing the one or more community members with the ability to remove a community member from the community.

4. The method of claim 1, wherein the implementing an enrollment model to determine whether to enroll the one or more identified end user persons as members in the community includes:

identifying one or more criteria for defining a role in the collaborative computing community;

obtaining role profiles for each of the end user persons; and

determining if one or more role profiles match the one or more criteria.

5. The method of claim 4, wherein the one or more criteria for defining a role in the collaborative computing community includes payment of a predetermined fee.

6. The method of claim 1, wherein the implementing an enrollment model includes providing one or more of the end user persons with the ability to grant enrollment to themselves.

7. The method of claim 6 further including providing the one or more end user persons with the ability to remove themselves from the community.

8. The method of claim 2, wherein the implementing an enrollment model includes designating one or more community members as a sponsor member having privileges, the sponsor member granted a further privilege of sponsoring one or more of the end user persons for community membership as a sponsored member, wherein the sponsored member is granted enrollment in the community with privileges equal or less than the privileges of the sponsor member.

9. The method of claim 8, wherein the sponsored member is enrolled as a community member if voted into the community.

10. The method of claim 8, wherein the sponsored member is enrolled as a community member after the passage of a predetermined amount of time.

Claims 11-30 were canceled.

31. An electronic computer readable storage medium storing a computer program which when executed defines a method for managing member enrollment in a collaborative computing community, the computer program performing a method comprising:

identifying one or more end user persons for enrollment in the collaborative computing community;

implementing an enrollment model, executing in memory by a processor of a collaborative computing server, to determine whether to enroll the one or more identified end user persons as members in the community; and

updating community membership to enroll the one or more end user persons based on the implemented enrollment model.

32. The computer readable storage medium of claim 31, wherein the implementing an enrollment model includes designating one or more community members as administrators with the authority to grant enrollment to the one or more end user persons.

33. The computer readable storage medium of claim 32, wherein the method performed by the stored computer program when executed further includes providing the one or more community members with the ability to remove a community member from the community.

34. The computer readable storage medium of claim 31, wherein the implementing an enrollment model to determine whether to enroll the one or more identified end user persons as members in the community includes:

identifying one or more criteria for defining a role in the collaborative computing community;

obtaining role profiles for each of the end user persons; and

determining if one or more role profiles match the one or more criteria.

35. The computer readable storage medium of claim 34, wherein the one or more criteria for defining a role in the collaborative computing community includes payment of a predetermined fee.

36. The computer readable storage medium of claim 31, wherein the implementing an enrollment model includes providing one or more of the end user persons with the ability to grant enrollment to themselves.

37. The computer readable storage medium of claim 36, wherein the method performed by the stored computer program when executed further includes providing the one or more end user persons with the ability to remove themselves from the community.

38. The computer readable storage medium of claim 32, wherein implementing an enrollment model includes designating one or more community members as a sponsor member having privileges, the sponsor member granted a further privilege of sponsoring one or more of the end user persons for community membership as a sponsored member, wherein the sponsored member is granted enrollment in the community with privileges equal or less than the privileges of the sponsor member.

39. The computer readable storage medium of claim 38, wherein the sponsored member is enrolled as a community member if voted into the community.

40. The computer readable storage medium of claim 38, wherein the sponsored member is enrolled as a community member after the passage of a predetermined amount of time.

41. A system for managing member enrollment in a networked collaborative computing community, the system comprising:

- a workstation; and

- a collaborative computing server in data communication with the workstation via the network, the collaborative computing server being operative to:

 - identify one or more end user persons for enrollment in the collaborative computing community;

 - implement an enrollment model to determine whether to enroll the one or more identified end user persons as members in the community; and

update community membership to enroll the one or more end user persons based on the implemented enrollment model.

42. The system of claim 41, wherein implementing an enrollment model includes designating one or more community members as administrators with the authority to grant enrollment to the one or more end user persons.

43. The system of claim 42, wherein the collaborative computing server is further operative to provide the one or more community members with the ability to remove a community member from the community.

44. The system of claim 41, wherein the implementing an enrollment model to determine whether to enroll the one or more identified end user persons as members in the community includes:

identifying one or more criteria for defining a role in the collaborative computing community;

obtaining role profiles for each of the end user persons; and

determining if one or more role profiles match the one or more criteria

45. The system of claim 44, wherein the one or more criteria for defining a role in the collaborative computing community includes payment of a predetermined fee.

46. The system of claim 41, wherein the implementing an enrollment model includes providing one or more of the end user persons with the ability to grant enrollment to themselves.

47. The system of claim 46 wherein the collaborative computing server is further operative to provide the one or more end user persons with the ability to remove themselves from the community.

48. The system of claim 42, wherein the implementing an enrollment model includes designating one or more community members as a sponsor member having privileges, the sponsor member granted a further privilege of sponsoring one or more of the end user persons for community membership as a sponsored member, wherein the sponsored member is granted enrollment in the community with privileges equal or less than the privileges of the sponsor member.

49. The system of claim 48, wherein the sponsored member is enrolled as a community member if voted into the community.

50. The system of claim 48, wherein the sponsored member is enrolled as a community member after the passage of a predetermined amount of time.

IX. EVIDENCE APPENDIX

No evidence submitted pursuant to 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.130, 1.131, or 1.132 of this title or of any other evidence entered by the Examiner has been relied upon by Appellants in this Appeal, and thus no evidence is attached hereto.

X. RELATED PROCEEDINGS APPENDIX

Since Appellants are unaware of any related appeals and interferences, no decision rendered by a court or the Board is attached hereto.